

To: Janell Bergman

From: Celia Greenman  
Date: July 14, 1993**SUBJECT: MEETING MINUTES**

Janell I didn't bring home a copy of my minutes to see the format. I've enclosed a summary of the meeting and then several pages of dialogue so you can see if anything needs to be added. Hope this is OK. Perhaps MAA can review.

Meeting Subject: Discussion of COC elimination

Meeting Place: ROY F WESTON

Meeting Date: July 13, 1993 1:00

**LIST OF ATTENDEES**

Attendee	Affiliation
Cindy Gee	EG&G
Dennis Smith	EG&G
Paul Singh	MMES RFO
Mike Anderson	WESTON
Diane Niedzwiecki	CDH
Celia Greenman	WESTON
Jeff Swanson	CDH
Amy Johnson	CDH
Joe Schieffelin	CDH
Scott Grace	DOE/ERD
Howard Rose	DOE/RFO
Gary Klecman	EPA
Ted Ball	PRC
Bonnie Lavelle	EPA

Cindy Gee began the meeting by announcing the topic of discussion, the determination of what is a contaminant. She was adamant that a decision was needed and asked that the discussion stay focused.

Discussion began on the nature of the data set. EPA had concerns that the data set they received on diskette was not the one used for statistical summaries. WESTON explained that for the statistical summary the data were Ganssekyized. That is, if a value was nondetect and the detection limit was twice the CDL limit, then it was thrown out. Otherwise the statistical analysis would be biased on the high side. For the ANOVA test, there was no Ganssekyizing. The ANOVA tests on background and site data used the same methodology.

**ADMIN RECORD**

A 0001 001103

EPA had a concern that there was a disconnect in that the number of records in the data set received on diskette was different from the number of values listed in the statistical summary. Specific examples would be provided to WESTON.

A discussion ensued regarding how sediment and surface water data from OUI and OUS would be used cooperatively. The session broke for consideration of the topic. Cindy Gee asked for a consensus that the decisions arrived at would be final and that the subject matter would not need further review. After deliberation, EPA stated that if something different were decided later, they would take responsibility for rescheduling.

Discussion turned on individual analytes:

Tritium	Can be dismissed by reason of spatial argument
Molybdenum	Can be dismissed by reason of spatial argument
Lead	Will remain in debate
Arsenic	Can be dismissed. Need to look into TDS results, if they exist, for samples with high arsenic concentrations. EPA will respond if they reconsider.
Antimony	Can be dismissed
Mercury	Can be dismissed
Silicon	Can be dismissed by reason of spatial argument. Check to see if clay content in background and site samples was measured for possible comparison.
Barium	Can be dismissed. Only appears in sediments.
Aluminum	Can be dismissed. Will look into turbidity or TDS values for samples with high aluminum concentrations.

The discussion of metals concluded with EPA conceding that they were still pondering the applicability of the methodology, although they had no real problems eliminating certain metals. WESTON stated that the statistical data would be reviewed for any QA/QC problems.

The topic then turned to organic contaminants. WESTON brought up the subject of laboratory contamination samples with regard to acetone, methylene chloride and 2-butanone. This problem was widespread even in background samples. CDH appeared incredulous that 28% of the background samples could contain laboratory contamination. They asked how it could be determined that a compound was a laboratory contaminant and not just present in the background samples. WESTON responded that over time, the laboratory contaminants showed much more variability than compounds known to be contaminants.

The question of how to treat PAHs was brought up. There was a basic difference in thought. EG&G wanted to limit COCs in the risk assessment to known sources. EPA wanted to consider exposure regardless of known source. EG&G thought that this was an upper management decision. CDH raised the concern that they had not commented heavily on PAHs in the draft report because it was implied that they would be discussed in the risk assessment. If PAHs were dropped en masse because EG&G considered these compounds parking lot materials, it would change CDH's response to the final report. CDH suggested that PAHs be discussed in a different forum as the issue was relevant to each OU. EG&G said they would consider that.

( DH asked if the contaminants agreed on today would be those discussed in the Nature and Extent of Contamination and in the remainder of the RI. E&G concurred stating that discussions for each contaminant would be included in the RI.